

4-3-1991

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/03/1991

Sue Tirotta

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Tirotta, Sue, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 04/03/1991" (1991). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 687.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/687>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Central Washington University

April 3, 1991

Presiding Officer: Charlie McGehee
Recording Secretary: Sue Tirotta

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Alawiye, Duncan, Farkas, Medlar, Smith and Wallace.
Visitors: Phil Backlund, Ken Harsha, Gerald Stacy, Anne Denman, Rosie Zwanziger, Carolyn Wells, Chip Simmons, Don Schliesman, Jack Dugan, Jim Pappas, Gary Heesacker and Carol Barnes.

CHANGES TO AGENDA

-Add two reports after Report #6 (CFR): 1) NCATE Accreditation Update - Jack McPherson and 2) Search for Dean of Library Services - Anne Denman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 27, 1991 Faculty Senate meeting were accepted with the following change: Change wording of MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2800A from: "...a funded salary allocation schedule for university faculty and part-time faculty, which includes librarians, and teaching assistants,..." to read "...a funded salary allocation schedule for teaching faculty, library faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants..."

COMMUNICATIONS

-3/12/91 letter from Philip Tolin, Psychology, regarding instructional workload/contact hours; referred to Academic Affairs Committee.
-3/14/91 letter from James Brennan, History, regarding withdrawal policy; referred to Academic Affairs Committee.
-3/22/91 letter from Dale Otto, Education/ECE-TESL, re. administrative structure; referred to Executive Committee.
-3/26/91 letter from Victor Marx, Library, requesting a change in the wording of MOTION NO. 2800; see Approval of 2/27/91 Minutes (above).

REPORTS

1. **CHAIR**

-Chair McGehee reported the results of the confidence vote on Provost Robert Edington (attached).
-Chair McGehee announced nominees for the 1991-92 Faculty Senate Executive Committee and solicited nominations from the floor and discussion on the nominations.
*MOTION NO. 2803 Ken Gamon moved and Pat McLaughlin seconded a motion to approve the 1991-92 Faculty Senate Executive Committee, as follows:
CHAIR: Charles McGehee (Sociology)
VICE CHAIR: Connie Roberts (BEAM)
SECRETARY: Erlice Killorn (PEHLS)
AT-LARGE: Jim Ponzetti (Home Economics)
AT-LARGE: Don Ringe (Geology)
Motion passed. [Terms of office begin on June 15, 1991.]

2. PRESIDENT

President Donald Garrity announced that he has accepted the resignation of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Robert Edington.

President Garrity reported that Governor Gardner's original budget, which requested a 7% reduction in the C.W.U. budget, was modified following a March revenue forecast predicting \$100 million more in revenues than was previously anticipated. The revised Governor's budget proposes reduction of C.W.U.'s ERL (carry-forward) budget by 3.3% but includes few other changes for Central.

The House of Representatives' budget also requests a 3.3% reduction in Central's carry-forward budget but grants an enrollment increase of 246 FTE (117 FTE the first year of the biennium and 129 FTE the second year of the biennium). Faculty, exempt staff, teaching/research assistants and classified staff would receive 3.1% and 3.4% salary increases on January 1, 1992 and January 1, 1993 respectively. Additional funds would be provided to bring some classified staff salaries closer to market value and partially fund certain civil service reclassifications. The proposed House budget also imposes a penalty on both over-enrollment and under-enrollment above or below a 3% margin for error.

A Senate budget proposal is anticipated next week.

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS

Jack Dugan delivered the following report and recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators (Jack Dugan, Sociology (Chair); Bob Carbaugh, Economics; Ken Harsha, BEAM; John Silva, Psychology):

"After a thorough review and discussion of the three previous surveys of faculty opinion about administrators, the Committee believes that the procedures used did not provide adequate data to support the Senate's stated objective of encouraging improvement in the quality of academic administration.

We believe this is true for several reasons:

1. A high proportion of non-returns and "insufficient information" responses were obtained. In 1985, 50 percent of the faculty did not return the survey. In 1987 and 1989, the percent of faculty who did not return the survey was 72 percent (254/351) and 59 percent (200/340) respectively. The proportion of "insufficient information" responses in returned questionnaires was also high. We conclude from these results that most faculty either are not in a position to evaluate administrators on many criteria or are unwilling to do so. The resulting low response-rate seriously questions the representativeness of the data and its validity for drawing conclusions about an administrator's performance.
2. The procedures have not been developed with adequate input and acceptance by the administrators it purports to evaluate. Without this, there is much less possibility that the results will be use by administrators. Our investigation indicates that the administrators have not considered the previous surveys to be useful.

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY OPINION SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS, continued

3. The surveys' rating scales simply indicate a respondent's belief about the extent to which an administrator does or does not manifest some behavior. These responses do not provide any qualitative discussion of what observations have contributed to this judgement. Therefore, they do not provide any substantive feedback about what behaviors might be more effective.

For these reasons, the committee cannot in good conscience recommend proceeding with the present survey. We recommend that the Senate suspend the by-law requiring faculty evaluation of administrators until next year when the ad-hoc committee can implement new procedures for the evaluation. These procedures will be created in consultation with the appropriate administrators to identify relevant populations with expertise to evaluate each administrator and develop items which each administrator feels are relevant and useful to the performance of his/her job. The committee would also like to review the question of which administrators should be subject to faculty evaluation. Time constraints do not allow completion of this process before the end of the academic year."

*MOTION NO. 2804 Patrick McLaughlin moved and Erlice Killorn seconded a motion to suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2. until academic year 1991-92: "The Faculty Senate shall conduct faculty opinion surveys of academic administrators -- deans, vice-president for academic affairs, president of the university -- every two (2) years beginning in the academic year 1986-87. For purposes of devising and conducting the survey, the Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee of members of the faculty."

Senator Ken Hammond stated that he served on the original Ad Hoc Committee with Doris Jakubek, Beverly Heckart, Gary Heesacker and Greg Trujillo and that administrative feedback was used in devising the current survey instrument. Senators questioned the significance of the low rate of return and whether modifying the instrument would improve the return rate. Jack Dugan replied that the committee is investigating the possibility of surveying specific populations within the university rather than the faculty at large. Chair McGehee reminded the Senate that a 2/3 majority vote would be required to suspend the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

A show of hands vote was held on MOTION NO. 2804. Motion defeated (12 yes, 14 no, 5 abstentions).

4. ACCESS PROGRAM & MINORITY RETENTION

Rosie Zwanziger, Director of Access Program/Special Services described the three Special Services programs: 1) Access Program (formerly Educational Opportunities Program), 2) Minority Retention Program and 3) Disabled Student Services.

She explained that the Access Program is designed to allow underrepresented populations (students of color and/or disability, students outside the average 18-22 age range, GED graduates, displaced homemakers, Veterans, etc.) to succeed at Central. She emphasized that Access Program students must first be denied admission under standard

4. ACCESS PROGRAM AND MINORITY RETENTION, continued

procedures and must then show the behavioral maturity, motivation, goal directedness and overall potential to perform college level work. Although Access students often take longer to graduate, close contact with advisers/counselors and application of other services such as tutoring have resulted in a high retention rate and GPAs comparable to those of regular students. Students are encouraged to work with the Access Program from admission through graduation. The Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board allows up to 15% of the regular Freshman class FTE to be apportioned to Access Program students; 24 students were admitted to Central's Access Program last year.

the greatest loss in terms of minority student retention is
1FF
5-1-91

The Minority Retention Program is a voluntary program designed to acquaint minority Freshmen with the services available to them at Central, including peer advising and tutoring. Ms. Zwanziger noted that ~~most minority college students fail~~ ^{students} during ~~their~~ first year. Since the Minority Retention Program was implemented at Central in 1987, the retention rate of ~~minorities~~ ^{Freshman} has risen from 58% to 86%, and minority students' GPAs are now equal to or greater than those of the Freshman class in general. Faculty are encouraged to refer Freshman minority students to this program.

The Disabled Student Services Program is required by law and provides special services such as note-takers for those who are unable to take notes, taped textbooks and alternative testing.

5. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE (FLR)

Phil Backlund, Communication, reported that this is his third, and final, year as Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR). Bob Wieking, IET, has been apprenticing as a FLR this year and will continue in the position next year. Dr. Backlund noted the importance of C.W.U.'s written "priority list" in conveying Central's wishes to legislators, and he rated Central's faculty presence in Olympia as excellent.

The main focus of the FLRs this year has been on bills concerning the biennial budget, enrollment increases and faculty salaries. Dr. Backlund pointed out that, since the area of higher education is the largest single discretionary item on the state budget, it has been the mission of the legislative representatives to emphasize the importance of an investment in higher education to the welfare of the entire state. He added that some increase in enrollment lids is probable, that faculty salary adjustments are uncertain, and that the effort to repeal the Master's degree requirement for teachers will probably fail.

A Senate bill requiring proven English language proficiency of all instructors was heard by the House Higher Education Committee earlier today. Chair McGehee noted that he sent a letter to the members of the House Higher Education Committee stating that evaluation of language proficiency should remain the responsibility of each university rather than an external agency, and FLR Bob Wieking testified before the committee to this effect. Senator Barry Donahue criticized the Senate Chair for stating a "faculty position" before determining the wishes of the entire faculty. Chair McGehee explained that the bill was brought to his attention with very short notice for a reply and that the Senate Chair must sometimes exercise individual judgment in interpreting the faculty's wishes.

6. COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES (CFR)

CFR member Ken Gamon, Math, reiterated that the language used in the Senate bill regarding English proficiency was vague and that other state schools would be more severely affected than Central if the bill passed. Dr. Gamon also reported that the CFR has taken a stance that university faculty salaries should be at least that of their K-12 counterparts.

7. NCATE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

NCATE Coordinating Committee chair Jack McPherson, Education, distributed an update on the progress that is being made in preparation for an NCATE accreditation visit in the fall of 1992. The Committee plans to brief faculty periodically through a newsletter. Dr. McPherson reported that Dr. Ann Shelly (U. of Alabama/Birmingham) and Dr. Barbara Burch (California State University/Fresno) have been invited to campus to hold workshops on April 11 and April 12 respectively. Both have had significant experience with NCATE examination and accreditation procedures, and they will help to facilitate Central's planning process.

8. SEARCH FOR DEAN OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Search Committee chair Anne Denman, Associate Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, reported that nearly 50 applications were received for the position of Dean of Library Services; of these, 44 applicants met the minimum qualifications and there were several very strong applicants. The list of finalists should be completed by the end of April, and on-campus interviews will commence in early May. In the interim period, Dean of Undergraduate Studies Don Schliesman is working with a 3 person team of Library personnel (Patrick McLaughlin/Reference, Robert Jones/Automated and Technical Services, and William Craig/Instructional Media Center) to coordinate daily Library services.

9. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

No report

10. BUDGET COMMITTEE

No report

11. CODE COMMITTEE

No report

12. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

*MOTION NO. 2805 Warren Street moved to change Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide, Page 16, Section 14, regarding DEPT 500 courses, as follows:

"The appropriate department prefix and department need for the courses will be established prior to catalog entry through the curriculum process. ~~Grading (S/U or Letter grades) will be determined at the time of content approval.~~ All 500 courses should be graded S or U; justification for letter grades is required. There is no limit on the number of times such a course may be offered. Each offering will have its own title and transcript entry which will appear as: DEPT 500. PD: (title). Credits. Once the "500" number has been approved as a catalog

12. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, continued

entry for a department, subsequent Professional Development courses within that department will follow the approval process given above for Special Topics (1987) course proposals; however, new content requests may be offered concurrently with the review period. course proposals should be submitted on the appropriate form obtained from the Graduate Office or department office. Course proposals must be submitted to Extended University Programs at least four weeks prior to the first class session or they will not be considered. Motion passed.

*MOTION NO. 2806 Warren Street moved to change Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide, Page 10, New Section 5 (this new section was adopted by the Senate as MOTION 2780 on October 31, 1990), as follows:

"5. Program descriptions

Major and minor programs should be introduced by a brief description of the subject content of the major and, when applicable, entry skill requirements, formal requirements for admission to the program, specialization options, advisement procedures, and professional applications." Motion passed.

*MOTION NO. 2807 Warren Street moved approval of University Curriculum Committee pages 1116-1120 as distributed. Motion passed.

PAGE

1116-17	IET/Manufacturing Engineering Technology	Program Change
1117	PSY 583	Course Addition
1117-18	School Psychology Certification	Program Change
1118	HOF5 439	Program Change
1118-19	ECON Minor I	Program Change
1120	M.A./English	Program Change

13. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

No report

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

* * * * * NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 1, 1991 * * * * *

Central
Washington
University



Faculty Senate

Bouillon 240
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-3231

TO: The President, Board of Trustees, Faculty

FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

DATE: March 14, 1991

On February 27, 1991, the Faculty Senate passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate within two weeks from the date of this Senate agenda, will sponsor and conduct among the entire faculty as defined in sections 2.10, 2.15, 7.20, 7.25 and other relevant sections of the Faculty Code as interpreted by the Faculty Senate Code Committee, a formal vote to ascertain the "confidence" or "no-confidence" the faculty have in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University. And

Be it further resolved: That the results of this vote of confidence will be made available to the Faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees.

Pursuant to this motion the Senate Executive Committee sent ballots to all members of the faculty as defined in the Faculty Code as interpreted by the Faculty Senate Code Committee. Ballots were sent via U. S. Mail to off-campus facilities and to faculty on professional leave if their addresses were known. The ballot asked the Faculty to respond to the following items:

- ☐ I have confidence in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University.
- ☐ I have no confidence in Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University.
- ☐ I do not know enough about Robert V. Edington in his capacity as Provost of Central Washington University to respond.
- ☐ I abstain from this poll.

Accompanying each ballot was a notice on paper of contrasting color making the recipient aware that the Provost had scheduled a series of informational meetings with faculty of the schools and colleges of the university prior to the end of the voting period.

Continued on back

Further accompanying the ballots were two envelopes with instructions to mark and seal the ballot in the smaller envelope labeled "OFFICIAL BALLOT" and then to seal the official ballot envelope in the larger envelope marked "RETURN TO FACULTY SENATE." Faculty were further instructed to sign the outer envelope to validate the ballot, and return the envelope so that it would be received in the Faculty Senate Office no later than 5:00 p.m., March 13, 1991.

All ballots were logged in as they were returned. Ballots which were returned in unsigned envelopes were not valid and were not accepted. To insure integrity of the vote, all returned ballots were kept in a secure place under the control of the Internal Auditor.

To guarantee anonymity, the outer envelopes were separated from the inner envelopes before the ballots were removed and counted. Ballots were again logged as the outer envelopes were opened. Ballots were numbered sequentially as they were removed from the envelopes.

Opening and counting of ballots took place in executive session of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In addition to members of the Executive Committee Charles McGehee, Chair; Pat McLaughlin, Vice-Chair; Connie Roberts, Secretary; Ken Gamon, At-Large Representative; and Erlice Killorn, At-Large Representative; the opening and counting were witnessed and verified by Mr. Ezzat E. Mina, CWU Internal Auditor and Mr. Richard G. Thompson, Jr., Director of Government and Corporate Relations for CWU.

The results are as follows:

Ballots:

370	Total faculty eligible to vote
52	Ballots not returned
0	Invalid ballots (i.e., envelope not signed)
0	Invalid ballots (i.e., multiple, unclear or no marks)
318	Total valid ballots returned (86% returned)

Vote distribution:

61	(19%) Confidence
213	(67%) No confidence
34	(11%) Do not know enough to respond
<u>10</u>	<u>(3%) Abstain</u>

318 (100%) Total valid votes

Respectfully submitted,



Charles L. McGehee, Chair
Faculty Senate

cc: The Provost

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday, April 3, 1991
SUB 204-205

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 27, 1991
 - Change wording of MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 2800A from: "...a funded salary allocation schedule for university faculty and part-time faculty, which includes librarians, and teaching assistants,..." to read "...a funded salary allocation schedule for teaching faculty, library faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants..."
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 - 3/12/91 letter from Philip Tolin, Psychology, re. instructional workload/contact hours; referred to Academic Affairs Committee.
 - 3/14/91 letter from James Brennan, History, re. withdrawal policy; referred to Academic Affairs Committee.
 - 3/22/91 letter from Dale Otto, Education/ECE-TESL, re. administrative structure; referred to Executive Committee.
 - 3/26/91 letter from Victor Marx, Library, requesting a change in the wording of MOTION NO. 2800; see Approval of 2/27/91 Minutes (above).
- V. REPORTS
 1. **Chair**
 - Results of confidence vote on Provost
 - Election of 1991-92 Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

CHAIR: Charles McGehee	VICE CHAIR: Connie Roberts
SECRETARY: Erlice Killorn	AT-LARGE: Jim Ponzetti
AT-LARGE: Don Ringe	
 2. **President**
 3. **Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators** -
Jack Dugan, Sociology, Chair (see attached memo and motion)
 4. **Access Program & Minority Retention** -
Rosie Zwanziger, Director of Access Program/Special Services
 5. **Legislative Update** -
Phil Backlund, Communication, Faculty Legislative Representative
 6. **Council of Faculty Representatives** -
Ken Gamon, Math, CFR Member
 7. **Academic Affairs Committee**
 8. **Budget Committee**
 9. **Code Committee**
 10. **Curriculum Committee**
 - Changes in Curriculum Guide (see attached motions)
 - UCC Pages 1116-1120
 11. **Personnel Committee**
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*** NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: May 1, 1991 ***

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: **Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Opinion Survey of Administrators --**
Jack Dugan, Sociology (Chair); Bob Carbaugh, Economics; Ken Harsha,
BEAM;
John Silva, Psychology
DATE: March 26, 1991
Subject: Faculty Opinion Survey

After a thorough review and discussion of the three previous surveys of faculty opinion about administrators, the Committee believes that the procedures used did not provide adequate data to support the Senate's stated objective of encouraging improvement in the quality of academic administration.

We believe this is true for several reasons:

1. A high proportion of non-returns and "insufficient information" responses were obtained. In 1985, 50 percent of the faculty did not return the survey. In 1987 and 1989, the percent of faculty who did not return the survey was 72 percent (254/351) and 59 percent (200/340) respectively. The proportion of "insufficient information" responses in returned questionnaires was also high. We conclude from these results that most faculty either are not in a position to evaluate administrators on many criteria or are unwilling to do so. The resulting low response-rate seriously questions the representativeness of the data and its validity for drawing conclusions about an administrator's performance.
2. The procedures have not been developed with adequate input and acceptance by the administrators it purports to evaluate. Without this, there is much less possibility that the results will be used by administrators. Our investigation indicates that the administrators have not considered the previous surveys to be useful.
3. The surveys' rating scales simply indicate a respondent's belief about the extent to which an administrator does or does not manifest some behavior. These responses do not provide any qualitative discussion of what observations have contributed to this judgement. Therefore, they do not provide any substantive feedback about what behaviors might be more effective.

For these reasons, the committee cannot in good conscience recommend proceeding with the present survey. We recommend that the Senate suspend the by-law requiring faculty evaluation of administrators until next year when the ad-hoc committee can implement new procedures for the evaluation. These procedures will be created in consultation with the appropriate administrators to identify relevant populations with expertise to evaluate each administrator and develop items which each administrator feels are relevant and useful to the performance of his/her job. The committee would also like to review the question of which administrators should be subject to faculty evaluation. Time constraints do not allow completion of this process before the end of the academic year.

MOTION: Suspend Faculty Senate Bylaws section IV.C.2. until academic year 1991-92: "The Faculty Senate shall conduct faculty opinion surveys of academic administrators -- deans, vice-president for academic affairs, president of the university -- every two (2) years beginning in the academic year 1986-87. For purposes of devising and conducting the survey, the Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee of members of the faculty."

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

- MOTION #1:** Change to Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide, Page 16, Section 14, regarding DEPT 500 courses:

The appropriate department prefix and department need for the courses will be established prior to catalog entry through the curriculum process. ~~Grading (S/U or letter grades) will be determined at the time of content approval.~~ Grading will normally be S/U. There is no limit on the number of times such a course may be offered. Each offering will have its own title and transcript entry which will appear as: DEPT 500. PD: (title). Credits. Once the "500" number has been approved as a catalog entry for a department, subsequent Professional Development ~~courses within that department will follow the approval process given above for Special Topics (198) course proposals.~~ However, new content requests may be offered concurrently with the review period. course proposals should be submitted on the appropriate form obtained from the Graduate Office or department office. Course proposals must be submitted to Extended University Programs at least four weeks prior to the first class session or they will not be considered.

- MOTION #2:** Change to Curriculum Planning and Procedures guide, Page 10, New Section 5 (this new section was adopted by the Senate as MOTION 2780 on October 31, 1990):

5. Program descriptions

Major and minor programs should be introduced by a brief description of the subject content of the major and, when applicable, entry skill requirements, formal requirements for admission to the program, specialization options, advisement procedures, and professional applications.

Osman ALAWIYE
☒ E.E. BILYEU
☒ Peter BURKHOLDER
☒ David CARNS
☒ John CLARK
☒ Ken CORY
☒ David DARDA
☒ Barry DONAHUE
Clint DUNCAN
Steven FARKAS
☒ Jennifer FISHER
☒ Ken GAMON
☒ Donald GARRITY
☒ Ed GOLDEN
☒ Ken HAMMOND
☒ Jim HAWKINS
☒ Erlice KILLORN
☒ Karina KUHLMEIER
☒ Larry LOWTHER
☒ Charles McGEHEE
☒ Patrick McLAUGHLIN
☒ Jack McPHERSON
Deborah MEDLAR
☒ Vince NETHERY
☒ Steve OLSON
Patrick OWENS
☒ Gary PARSON
☒ John PICKETT
☒ Jim PONZETTI
☒ Owen PRATZ
☒ Connie ROBERTS
☒ Eric ROTH
☒ Tami SCHRANK
Stephen SMITH
☒ Warren STREET
☒ Alan TAYLOR
Randall WALLACE
☒ Rex WIRTH
☒ Roger YU

Andrea BOWMAN
Dieter ROMBOY
Raeburne HEIMBECK
Walter KAMINSKI
Teresa MARTIN
Gary GALBRAITH
John CARR
George TOWN
Walt EMKEN
Don RINGE
Stephen HINTHORNE
Robert EDINGTON
Morris UEBELACKER
Betty EVANS
Patricia MAGUIRE
Dan RAMSDELL
Charles HAWKINS
Dick WASSON
Stephen JEFFERIES
John HERUM
☒ Thomas YEH
George KESLING
Andrew SPENCER
Ethan BERGMAN
Jim GREEN
Ken HARSHA
Geoffrey BOERS
Richard MACK
Max ZWANZIGER
Roger GARRETT
Robert JACOBS

April 13, 1991

Date

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Phil Backlund

Ken Harsha

Gerald Hing

Anne Derman

Rosie Zwanziger

Barry Welch

Chip Simmons

Don Sullivan

Jack Dugan

Tim Pappas

Gary Heesacker

Don-EUP-Carol Barnes

Please sign your name and return this sheet to the Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting. Thank you.

Central
Washington
University



History Department

Language & Literature 100T
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1655

James F. Brennan
Department of History
Campus

RECEIVED

March 14, 1991

Charles McGehee
Chairman Faculty Senate
Campus

MAR 12 1991
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dear Charles,

I hate to complain so much. However, the students have taken the new withdrawal policy and found ways of abusing it. The drop deadline is so late that in one of my classes the two hour exams are graded and handed back before then. Last quarter six students took the opportunity to drop when they did not do well on the second exam. There is another way I see this problem. I am an advisor in Law and Justice. I now receive a copy of the whole academic record here before advising day. The students use the policy in a manner which encourages irresponsibility. This is especially the case with those students who swear that they will never read a textbook and when they face the consequences of this, they simply drop and shop around for courses which they consider less demanding. If we continue to create and implement such policies the problem of an enrollment lid will vanish. Students will take six years for a four year program. We are well on that way to that already.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely

James F. Brennan
James F. Brennan

Central
Washington
University



Department of Psychology
Ellensburg, Washington 98926
(509) 963-2381

March 12, 1991

Dr. Charles McGehee, Chair
C.W.U. Faculty Senate
Campus

RECEIVED

MAR 13 1991

CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dear Charles:

The attached article appeared in the March 11 edition of the Seattle P-I. One cannot but lament the fact that there may be some members of the faculties of the UW branch campuses or WWU who make more than some of the myriad world-class scholars at the UW main campus.

My main concern, however, is with the discussion of teaching loads. According to the article, the "original plan was for branch professors to teach seven to nine courses (per year). But a hiring committee...told top officials that seven should be the maximum if the UW hoped to attract quality teaching". You will also note that this is considered a heavy teaching load, appropriate only for members of the branch campuses, who are not expected to do research.

As you obviously know, the standard teaching load at CWU is 36 hours/year. Assuming all 4-credit courses, that's 9 per year. I suppose it's possible for someone who teaches all 3-credit courses to do 12 (how horrible!). Regardless, this is the formal expectation for a faculty that also is expected to do research (albeit not at the level of the UW).

Which brings me to my point: It seems to me that the faculty ought to consider what constitutes an appropriate teaching load. There are a number of related questions. Among them:

- In the present climate, which requires scholarship for advancement, is an average 12-hour/ quarter teaching load appropriate?
- Do we as a faculty assume that four 3-credit classes constitute the same workload as three 4-credit classes? It seems to me that the former is far more onerous than the latter and that assigning a person four courses in a single quarter is an act of cruelty to the faculty member and a disservice to students.

•What criteria are used to determine whether a course gets 3 or 4 or 5 credits? Have these criteria been applied consistently? Certainly many students and faculty will attest to the fact that many 3 credit courses cover more material and require more work than many 4 credit courses. Given this, how much weight should be given to the actual number of *contact* hours and how much to the scholarly demands placed upon the students?

•Would it make sense to get rid of the "contact hour" standard and set loads in terms of number of courses (i.e., two or three or whatever number of courses per quarter, rather than "X" credits per quarter)? Some schools have done away entirely with the idea of course credits and simply require that students take a certain number of courses, rather than credit hours.

I may have missed it, but I don't recall that this has been the subject of recent faculty debate. Perhaps the Senate would be willing to take the lead in trying to rationalize instructional loads to ensure that they are compatible with the increasing expectations placed on the faculty.

Best Regards,



Philip Tolin

UW professors grumbling over branches

Tensions plague new venture

By Jane Hadley
P-I Reporter

Faculty members at the University of Washington's main campus are grumbling that those at new Bothell and Tacoma branch campuses are being paid as much as they are, and sometimes more.

The gripe is one of several that have surfaced on the main campus about the branches. Critics also say the branches have lower teaching loads than they were supposed to and are draining resources from the main campus.

The grumbling points to continuing tension in the relationship between the branches and the main campus, and to uncertainty over the nature of the branch campuses.

It also points to the difficulty the UW is having in trying to run two different types of university under one umbrella.

Main campus professors have repeatedly raised concerns over how the branches were set up and operated. One such eruption resulted in the departure of the branch campuses' first dean, Donna Kerr.

Top UW officials, fearful that bad publicity will harm the branches both in the public eye and the Legislature, play down the friction.

"It's unfair to in any way characterize my position, or the faculty members of this institution, as being opposed to the branch campuses," said Faculty Senate Chairman Keith Benson. "They are needed for the state. My position and (that of) others around me is we see things happening that were not what we were told last year."

UW officials were recently forced to respond to a bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, that sought to close both branches. Though the bill did not make it out of committee, it embarrassed UW officials.

The university and the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board have consistently said the branch campuses would be "separate and distinct" from the main campus.

The branches would focus on teaching rather than research. They would serve primarily older, working students, mostly women living or working within a half-hour of the schools. They would operate much like the state's regional colleges, such as Western Washington University.

Most officials assumed that to mean lower salaries and higher teaching loads than at the main campus. And it meant the UW would not issue identical diplomas to students graduating from branches.

The diploma issue still has not been worked out. And main campus faculty members are complaining that the disparity in salary and teaching loads is not what was promised.

Branch campus faculty members, especially at Bothell, have gripes too. They are asking for membership in the UW Faculty Senate. Benson said that was not possible because of the way the branches are set up.

Even if it were technically possible, he would not like to see it happen, because the branches are supposed to be "separate and distinct."

The salary complaints arose when UW faculty members objected to a proposal by Provost Laurel Wilkening to give merit increases to branch campus faculty members.

Professors pointed out that first-year faculty members on the main campus were not entitled to merit raises. After checking, Wilkening agreed that the branch campus merit raises should be rescinded.

No official analysis comparing salaries of branch and main campus faculty members was available, but Colin Brown, the UW official who set branch campus salaries, said it was his "impression" that they were lower. But there were exceptions, he said.

Benson, who said he had been studying UW salaries for the past two years, insisted that branch campus salaries were on average about the same as main campus salaries and in some cases higher.

UW documents show that most of the inexperienced new faculty members at the branch campuses are being paid \$30,200. By contrast, an assistant professor of Near Eastern languages hired this year on the main campus was paid \$27,700 and an English

See UW BRANCHES Page B3

UW branches: Teaching loads stir criticism on main campus

From Page B1

professor on the main campus is being paid \$29,400.

It is difficult to compare salaries using averages of large groups because they include different fields and levels of experience. But it appears that some faculty members at Western Washington University are also being paid more than UW faculty members — at both main and branch campuses.

As for the teaching loads, Benson said he had been told that branch campus professors would teach seven to nine courses a year. The main campus teaching load varies from four to six, because professors are expected

to concentrate on research.

When Benson, who said he teaches six courses a year, learned that branch campus faculty members were teaching six courses, he was peeved.

Branch Campus Dean Jack Keating said the UW's original plan was for branch professors to teach seven to nine courses. But a hiring committee, which Keating chaired, told top officials that seven should be the maximum if the UW hoped to attract quality candidates.

Officials changed the teaching load at the branches to seven, Keating said. This year it is six, because the branches are at only one-third to one-half of their planned enrollment and because

it was assumed that faculty members would have to spend time planning the new curriculum.

Michael Kalton, a professor of comparative religion and Korean studies at the Tacoma campus, said seven courses should be the maximum.

Citing recent publishing accomplishments of Tacoma faculty members, Kalton said, "I don't think anyone in the present faculty would settle for joining one of those universities where what you do is teach and that's it."

Recent conflict between the Bothell faculty and the UW Faculty Senate over the role of a "special committee" the Senate set up to help the new campus get

started has "cooled down a lot," Benson said.

Keating said he was only discouraged that the friction and news stories about low enrollment obscured the fact that the branch campuses had outstanding faculty members excited about what they were doing.

"I love the kind of students we have," Kalton said. "They're mostly in their mid-30s. They have considerable life experience behind them, so you can talk to them about really serious stuff. They're really very, very highly motivated."

"I love the kind of curriculum we're able to do, which allows us to address real issues and real questions."

Central
Washington
University



Department of Education
Black Hall
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

22 March, 1991



"Aaaaaaaaal Murray! ... A spider was
in my shoe!"

MARCH
13
WEDNESDAY

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1991
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and
The Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear colleagues:

Now that the effort to fix our shoe has run its course, I think we need to check the tent, to move on to other, more crucial issues of what is increasingly a clumsy, ineffective status quo. Here are a few initial thoughts.

First, administrative accountability needs to be created. We have taken one small step in this direction by abandoning the administrative evaluation instrument and process. The overall needs here include establishing a way for faculty to be regularly informed about key administrators' accomplishments, as well as creating a better feedback and assessment mechanism. Perhaps a regular written report, clearly referenced to specific job responsibilities or performance statements, plus face-to-face meeting arrangements to discuss this information, would provide at least some basis for our becoming better informed. Such key administrators would include the President the Provost, each Vice-president/Vice-provost and each Dean.

6F

P

Second, our antiquated, contradictory operational structure is in urgent need of attention. At present, we have a hierarchical, top-down, quasi-military structure to not only operate an educational enterprise but to also foster collegiality. Most successful businesses have abandoned this sort of management arrangement in favor of options which better match function and desired working relationships to structure. How inappropriate our current structure is can be exemplified by the fact that last Fall, all administrators received 'merit' salary increases (6.2% - 8%) and our President recently received a large salary increase (8.4%, calculated from January 1) with no voice from, or avenue of input for, faculty. Yet, the merit process for faculty is firmly in the grip of our administrators, with revisions of department-generated lists available to administrators at all levels from Chair to President. The utility of this example rests in the completeness of the contradiction, and in the power that merit and other salary matters have over our lives and fears. If we can't take a comprehensive look at our administrative structure, at the very least we need to create fairness of salary matters and effective accountability for our administrators to the faculty. We faculty are very accountable to our administrators, but the reverse isn't true.

Also in need of a close look is our departmental structure. How much longer will we bind ourselves up in cells of competitiveness, rather than create at least slightly more flexible groups of mutual interest?

There are other areas as well - including the budgeting process (based in part on competitiveness and favoritism rather than fairly assessed needs and opportunities), and our 'diversity/human relations' needs. Our administrative structure is now very weak. It is extremely important that we invest energies concurrently into both repair work and change, lest we languish. The Faculty Senate clearly has the key role to play.

Sincerely,

Dale Otto

Dale Otto

Central
Washington
University



Tullis Reference Library

University Library
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

(509) 963-1021

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1991

CWU FACULTY SENATE

March 26, 1991

Professor Charles McGehee
Chair Faculty Senate
CWU

Dear Professor McGehee:

The Faculty Senate is to be congratulated for passing Motion 2800 calling for funded annual salary increments for faculty, including librarians...

There is a danger though that amendment 2800A could be misinterpreted by legislators. 2800A could convey the notion that librarians are part-time faculty, for the amendment reads:

"... a funded salary allocation schedule for university faculty and part-time faculty, which includes librarians, and teaching assistants,..."

An editorial change can take care of the problem as follows:

"... a funded salary allocation schedule for teaching faculty, library faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants..."

This correction is necessary in my view because legislators and university administrators have been confused when pay raises were to be denied, or lower pay raises were to be awarded to "librarians who are exempt." That phrase was intended for library administrators with exempt status, but at CWU it was decided that it was meant to be applied to all librarians.

Yours sincerely,

Victor F. Marx
Full time library faculty



RECEIVED

APR 9 1991

CWU FACULTY SENATE

PRESIDENTIAL MEMOGRAM

April 8, 1991

REPORT NO. 33

HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR 1991-1993 BIENNIUM

The House budget proposal for the 1991-1993 biennium appeared recently. In most ways it continues to reflect the mood of the budget writers towards higher education set by the Governor's proposal.

The House proposal provides a reduced level of funding (-3.27%) from what will be necessary to continue our operations at current levels. The budget begins with a base calculation \$900,000 below ours and adds a cut of \$1.6 million. It then provides an increase of 117 FTE students the first year and raises that to 246 FTE the second year (an additional 129 FTE). This is funded by an addition of \$1.6 million. The dollars provided for these 246 additional FTE would be at a dollars-per-FTE figure that is 3/4 the actual cost of educating these people.

In simple terms the operating budget would have us handle increased FTE with fewer dollars.

The salary proposals for faculty, exempt staff and teaching and research assistants call for across-the-board increases of 3.1% and 3.4% on January 1, 1992 and January 1, 1993, respectively. In addition, a pool of money is provided to be used on those same dates "to grant salary increases . . . that address the most serious salary inequities among faculty and exempt staff."

The same across-the-board increases are funded for classified staff on the same dates as those proposed for faculty and exempt staff. Some additional funds would be provided for classified staff to bring certain ranges closer to their outside market value. Still another pool of money would be provided to fund partially certain civil service reclassifications.

Additional funding would be provided for some assistance for medical benefits.

The Senate version of the budget should appear within a week.

Central
Washington
University



Department of Education

Black Hall

Ellensburg, Washington 98928

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
All Faculty, School of Professional Studies
Teacher Education Council (T.E.C.)
Teacher Preparation Professional Education Advisory Board (P.E.A.B.)

FROM: NCATE Coordinating Committee*

SUBJECT: NCATE UPDATE

DATE: March 30, 1991

This is the first of a number of "NCATE UPDATES" you will receive to keep you informed of our progress in preparing for an NCATE accreditation visit in the fall of 1992.

CWU will seek NCATE accreditation!!

An NCATE Coordinating Committee* has been organized to ensure that all voices of the University are heard and incorporated in the planning process. Representing CLAS are Drs. Patsy Callaghan, Barney Erickson, and Libby Street. Representing SPS are Drs. Andrea Bowman, Erlice Killhorn, Sam Rust, and Randall Wallace. Also serving on the committee are Drs. Jimmie Applegate, Ron Frye, Don Cummings, and Dale LeFevre. Dr. Jack McPherson coordinates the activities of the group.

On March 25, consultant Dr. Barbara Burch was invited to campus for a preliminary meeting with the Coordinating Committee. Dr. Burch is Dean of the School of Education at California State University, Fresno. A veteran university administrator, she has been involved in NCATE and AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) leadership roles for many years.

During her meeting with the team, she reviewed the NCATE standards and, based on her reading of our Institutional Report and the NCATE Board of Examiners Report, interpreted strengths and weaknesses of our program.

She recommended that, as a first step, the University address NCATE Standard IA: Design of Curriculum. It is in relation to this standard that CWU was criticized because "There is no clearly articulated model that undergirds professional studies." Commonly referred to as the knowledge-base, the model is viewed by NCATE as the overriding force behind a program for teacher preparation.

Dr. Burch pointed out that as many as one-third of the schools seeking accreditation in recent reviews were found deficient in the area of the program's knowledge base. She also pointed out that this standard, more than any other, requires the teacher preparation faculty of the University to join together in a collaborative effort to agree on and articulate the program model.

To facilitate this effort and to ensure that we all understand the thinking of the NCATE examiners relative to this issue, Dr. Burch will be returning to campus April 11-12, with Dr. Ann Shelly, Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education, University of Alabama, Birmingham, to conduct inservice sessions for faculty and guests.

To minimize class conflicts on April 11 and 12, joint sessions have been scheduled for CLAS and SPS faculty involved in teacher preparation, the T.E.C. and P.E.A.B. guests as follows: (i.e., attend one session only each day).

April 11 (Thursday). Dr. Ann Shelly

9:00 - 11:30 NCATE Knowledge-Base Workshop #1 Grupe Conference Center
1:00 - 3:30 NCATE Knowledge-Base Workshop #2 Grupe Conference Center

April 12 (Friday). Dr. Barbara Burch

9:00 - 9:50 NCATE Orientation Session #1 Grupe Conference Center
2:00 - 2:50 NCATE Orientation Session #2 Grupe Conference Center

Maximum communication in the NCATE accreditation effort is essential. We hope you will clear your schedule on April 11 and 12 to attend one (1) session EACH DAY with both Dr. Shelly and Dr. Burch.

cc: President Donald L. Garrity
Provost Robert V. Edington
Donald M. Schliesman, Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Gerald J. Stacy, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research
Dr. Charles L. McGehee, Chair, Faculty Senate

54.8:16

February 7, 1991

116

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

INDUSTRIAL AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

PROGRAM CHANGE

AS IT APPEARS

Manufacturing Engineering Technology

Major **Advisor**
 G.W. Beed

This major prepares graduates for occupations related to manufacturing. Job titles might read as follows: Tool Engineer, Manufacturing Engineer, Numerical Control Programmer, Machine Planner, and Computer Assisted Machine Planner.

Credits earned in MATH 163.1 and PHY 111 will be allowed as partial fulfillment of the natural science Breadth Requirements as well as requirements of this major.

Students interested in engineering courses after graduation should complete PHYS 211, 212, 213 and math through differential equations.

Required Courses	Credits
MATH 163.1, Pre-Calculus I.....	5
MATH 163.2, Pre-Calculus II.....	5
MATH 172.1, Calculus.....	5
PHYS 111, Introductory Physics-Mechanics and Heat.....	5
PHYS 112, Introductory Physics-Electricity and Magnetism.....	5
PHYS 113, Introductory Physics-Sound and Light.....	5
CHEM 181, General Chemistry.....	5
MET 211, Structural Systems I.....	4

MET 212, Structural Systems II.....	5
MET 213, Technical Dynamics.....	5
MET 418, Mechanical Design I.....	5
MET 423, Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing.....	4
IET 160, Computer Aided Design and Drafting.....	3
IET 165, Engineering Drawing I.....	4
IET 255, Machining.....	4
IET 271, Basic Electricity.....	3
IET 271.1, Basic Electricity Laboratory.....	2
IET 310, Hydraulics/Pneumatics.....	4
IET 345, Production Technology.....	4
IET 351, Metallurgy-Materials and Processes.....	4
IET 355, Advanced Machining and NC Programming.....	4
IET 372, Basic Electronics.....	4
IET 375, Applied Digital Controls.....	3
IET 380, Quality Control.....	3
IET 388, Tool Design.....	4
IET 485, Senior Project OR	
IET 490, Contracted Field Experience.....	6
CPSC 101, Survey of Computer Science.....	4
BUS 281, Business Statistics.....	5
ADOM 385, Business Communications and Report Writing.....	5
Choose 8 credits from the IET courses listed below.	
IET 257, Casting Processing.....	4
IET 357, Welding.....	4
IET 382, Plastics and Composite Materials.....	4

Total 134

PROPOSED MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY MAJOR

Advisor - G. W. Beed

The major prepares graduates for occupations related to manufacturing. Job titles might be as follows: Tool Designer, CNC Programmer, Tool and Production Planner, Machine Planner, Research Specialist, and Manufacturing Technologist. Students pursuing this degree should work with the department advisor to assure that the prerequisites for the upper division requirements have been met.

Students must have the appropriate background in pre-calculus mathematics and basic engineering drawing. It may be necessary, by advisement, to take courses in these areas.

Required Courses:	Credits
A. Support Courses	
MATH 172.1 Calculus	5
MATH 172.2 Calculus	5
MATH 311, Statistical Concepts and Methods	5
PHYS 111, 112, 113, Introductory Physics OR	
PHYS 211, 212, 213, General Physics	15
CHEM 181, General Chemistry	5
CPSC 101, Computer Basics	4
ADOM 385, Business Communication and Report Writing	5

February 7, 1991

///7

11

**CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE**

INDUSTRIAL AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY CONTINUED

B. Technical Core

MET 211	Structural Systems I	5	
MET 212	Structural Systems II	5	
MET 213	Technical Dynamics	5	
MET 418	Mechanical Design I	5	
MET 423	Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing	4	
IET 160	Computer Aided Design and Drafting	3	
IET 255	Machining	4	
IET 265	Engineering Drawing II	4	
IET 271	Basic Electricity	3	
IET 271.1	Basic Electricity Laboratory	2	
IET 272	Basic Electronics	4	
IET 310	Hydraulics/Pneumatics	4	
IET 345	Production Technology	4	
IET 351	Metallurgy/Materials and Processes	4	
IET 355	Advanced Machining and CNC Programming	4	
IET 375	Microprocessor Applications	3	
IET 375.1	Microprocessor Applications Laboratory	1	
IET 380	Quality Control	5	
IET 388	Tool Design	4	
IET 495	Senior Project	6	
		79	
Choose 8 credits from the IET courses listed below:			
IET 257	Casting Processing	4	
IET 357	Welding/Fabrication	4	
IET 482	Plastics and Composites	4	8

TOTAL 131

PSYCHOLOGY

COURSE ADDITION

PSY 583. Consultation (3). Role of the consultant, stages of consultation, application of consultation principles to school and mental health settings.

R. Waddle moved, E. Bergman seconded, for approval of the above course addition; 6-0-0, motion approved.

PROGRAM CHANGE

AS IT APPEARS

REMAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY INITIAL CERTIFICATION: In addition to completing the Master's Degree Requirements, the candidate MUST complete all remaining certification requirements before being recommended to the State Board of Education for certification as a School Psychologist. These courses may be taken concurrently with the master's degree requirements. The following courses (or approved equivalents) are required:

<u>REQUIRED COURSES</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
PSY 447, Psychology of Adolescence	3
SPED 523, Curriculum for the Mildly/Moderately Handicapped	3
ED/PSY 525, Psychology of Reading	3
SPED 533, Education for the Disadvantaged Student	3
PSY 559, Advanced Educational Psychology	4
PSY 561, Group Counseling	3
PSY 573, Career Development	3
PSY 584, Behavior Disorders and Psychopathology	4
PSY 592.1, Practicum in School Psychology	3
PSY 592.2, Practicum in School Psychology	3
PSY 683, School Psychology Internship (one public school year, minimum 1200 clock hours)	15
Comprehensive Examination for Certification	0
Total Additional Credits for Certification	47

**CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE**

PSYCHOLOGY CONTINUED

PROPOSED

REMAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY INITIAL CERTIFICATION: In addition to completing the Master's Degree Requirements, the candidate **MUST** complete all remaining Certification requirements before being recommended to the State Board of Education for certification as a School Psychologist. These courses may be taken concurrently with the master's degree requirements. The following courses (or approved equivalents) are required:

REQUIRED COURSES	CREDITS
* ED 431, Intercultural Education,	3
* PSY 478, Physiological Psychology	3
ED/PSY 525, Psychology of Reading	3
SPED 523, Curriculum for the Mildly/Moderately Handicapped	3
PSY 559, Advanced Educational Psychology	4
PSY 561, Group Counseling	3
PSY 573, Career Development	3
* PSY 583, Consultation	3
PSY 584, Behavior Disorders and Psychopathology	4
PSY 592.1, Practicum in School Psychology	3
PSY 592.2, Practicum in School Psychology	3
* PSY 683, School Psychology Internship (one public school year, minimum 1200 clock hours)	12
Comprehensive Examination for Certification	0
Total Additional Credits for Initial Certification	47

HOME ECONOMICS, FAMILY AND CONSUMER STUDIES

COURSE ADDITION

HOF 439. Families and Public Policy (3). Prerequisite, HOF 334 or permission. Impact of governmental policies on families; policy implications of changes in the structure and composition of families.

ECONOMICS

PROGRAM CHANGE

AS IT APPEARS

ECONOMICS MINOR I

The minor is designed to accompany the Business Administration and Accounting majors.

Required:

Credits

A minimum of 10 credits from the following list:

ECON 301, Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis	5
ECON 302, Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis	5
ECON 310, International Economics	5
ECON 330, Money and Banking	5
ECON 332, Public Finance	5

Total 10

Electives:

A minimum of 10 credits from the above list or other 300-400 level economics courses with approval of the economics advisor

Total 20

February 7, 1991

1119

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

ECONOMICS CONTINUED

PROPOSED

ECONOMICS MINOR I

This minor is designed for business administration and accounting majors. Prior approval of electives by the Economics advisor is required.

Required:	Credits
-----------	---------

Econ 201, Principles of Economics Micro	5
Econ 202, Principles of Economics Macro	5

Electives:

A minimum of 5 credits from the following list:
Econ 301, Econ 302, Econ 310, Econ 330, Econ 332....5
A minimum of 10 additional credits from the above
list or other 300-400 level economics courses
with approval of the economics advisor10

Total 25

**CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE**

**ENGLISH
PROGRAM CHANGE
AS IT APPEARS**

**Master of Arts
English (Teaching English as a
Second Language/Teaching English as a
Foreign Language-TESL/TEFL)**

The TESL/TEFL option is for people who plan to teach English as a second or foreign language to adults. The major markets for such graduates would be in the ESL programs in American colleges and universities, in private ESL institutes, and in programs and schools that provide instruction in English in foreign countries.

Program. The program consists of 42 required core credits plus 10 guided elective credits. It includes an optional thesis and a required written examination. A prerequisite to completion of the program is at least the equivalent of two years of study of a second language at the college level.

Required Courses:	Credits
Required Core	
English Language Core	15
ENG 512, Introduction to Graduate Studies	5
English Language Learning sequence:	
ENG 586, 587	8
ENG 592, Practicum	2
TESL/TEFL Core	14
ENG 599, TESL/TEFL Seminar	4
ENG 589, ELL: Diagnosis and Testing	4
ENG 592, Practicum (peer teaching)	3
ENG 531, TESL/TEFL Methods and Materials	3
Language Development Core	7
ECE 415, Child Language Acquisition	3
PSY 373, Psychology of Thought and Language	4
ENG 700, Thesis or Non-thesis Option	6
Guided Electives	10
Culture Studies	
ANTH 381, Language in Culture	
ED 431, Intercultural Education	
Courses in English or foreign literature at the	
300-level or above	
Linguistics Studies	
ENG 320, 322, 413, 516, 588, 599	
ED 433, Educational Linguistics	
ED 418, Reading in Linguistics	
FNLA 491, Introduction to Romance Linguistics	
SPAN 383, Spanish-English Contrastive Linguistics	
PHIL 470, Philosophy of Language and Communication	
Pedagogical Studies	
ECE 312, Bilingual Education	
ENG 430, Teaching English in the Secondary School	
ENG 510, 511, Teaching Freshman English	
ED 434, Principles in Second Language Instruction	
ENG ED 498, 598, Special Topics in TESL/TEFL	

Written examination required

Total 52

Final Examination. The written exam will be four hours long and will cover an individualized reading list (equivalent to about 24 book-length studies) developed in consultation with the student's committee and growing out of work in the core courses.

**PROPOSED
Master of Arts
English (Teaching English as a
Second Language/Teaching English as a
Foreign Language-TESL/TEFL)**

The TESL/TEFL option is for people who plan to teach English as a second or foreign language to adults. The major markets for such graduates would be in the ESL programs in American colleges and universities, in private ESL institutes, and in programs and schools that provide instruction in English in foreign countries.

PROGRAM. The program consists of 42 required core credits plus 10 guided elective credits. It includes an optional thesis and a required written examination. [If the non-thesis option is selected, candidates with English literature majors will take an additional 6 credits in language or linguistics courses, but candidates with majors other than English literature will take the additional 6 credits in literature courses.] A prerequisite to completion of the program is at least the equivalent of two years of study of a second language at the college level.

Required Courses:	Credits
Required Core	
English Language Core	15
ENG 512, Introduction to Graduate Studies	5
English Language Learning sequence:	
ENG 586, 587	8
ENG 592, Practicum	2
TESL/TEFL Core	14
ENG 599, TESL/TEFL Seminar	4
ENG 589, ELL: Diagnosis and Testing	4
ENG 592, Practicum (peer teaching)	3
ENG 531, TESL/TEFL Methods and Materials	3
Language Development Core	7
ECE 415, Child Language Acquisition	3
PSY 373, Psychology of Thought and Language	4
ENG 700, Thesis or Non-thesis Option	6
Guided Electives	10
Culture Studies	
ANTH 381, Language in Culture	
ED 431, Intercultural Education	
Courses in English or foreign literature at the	
300-level or above	
Linguistics Studies	
ENG 320, 322, 413, 516, 588, 599	
ED 433, Educational Linguistics	
ED 418, Reading in Linguistics	
FNLA 491, Introduction to Romance Linguistics	
SPAN 383, Spanish-English Contrastive Linguistics	
PHIL 470, Philosophy of Language and Communication	
Pedagogical Studies	
ECE 312, Bilingual Education	
ENG 430, Teaching English in the Secondary School	
ENG 510, 511, Teaching Freshman English	
ED 434, Principles in Second Language Instruction	
ENG ED 498, 598, Special Topics in TESL/TEFL	

Written examination required

Total 52

Final Examination. The written exam will be four hours long and will cover an individualized reading list (equivalent to about 24 book-length studies) developed in consultation with the student's committee and growing out of work in the core courses.